



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The Examiner reminded Applicant that a change in location of known parts does not result in patentability, absent unexpected results due to the claimed locations. The Examiner contacted Applicant to ask what "significant advantages over the prior art" are meant by Applicant on page 24 in the reply filed 12/14/2009.

As shown in Applicant's Fig. 5-6, in order to unload arm 8A from the device, the arm must go backwards and forward. See especially Figure 6. Compare this to the device of Kuwajima et al, which has no overhang on the load side. The arm needs to move in only one direction to unload. The advantage of the back-then-forward movement is that the arm is more securely held by the device. The arm could accidentally come out of the device of Kuwajima et al by a shock in one direction.

The advantage of this configuration is shown in the disclosure, and the configuration is now clearly recited in the claims. Because the configuration has these significant advantages, Applicant asserted that this is more than a mere rearrangement of parts.

The operation of the device is discussed in detail on pages 41-55, and the goal is disclosed to hold the arm securely when an external force accidentally strikes the device.